NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

Measure Information

This document contains the information submitted by measure developers/stewards, but is organized according to NQF's measure evaluation criteria and process. The item numbers refer to those in the submission form but may be in a slightly different order here. In general, the item numbers also reference the related criteria (e.g., item 1b.1 relates to sub criterion 1b).

Brief Measure Information

NQF #: 2706
Corresponding Measures:
De.2. **Measure Title:** Pediatric Peritoneal Dialysis Adequacy: Achievement of Target Kt/V
Co.1.1. **Measure Steward:** Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
De.3. **Brief Description of Measure:** Percentage of pediatric (< 18 years old) peritoneal dialysis patient-months whose delivered peritoneal dialysis dose was a weekly Kt/Vurea >= 1.8 (dialytic + residual)
1b.1. **Developer Rationale:** The dose of dialysis is used to estimate the ability of peritoneal dialysis to clear the blood of accumulated toxins. In the adult population, outcome studies have shown an association between dose of hemodialysis in terms of small solute removal and clinical outcomes. Studies have shown a Kt/V of 1.8/week or greater in adult PD patients was associated with better serum albumin levels[1] and improved survival [2]. The ADEMEX did not show clinical benefit with in weekly Kt/V doses exceeding 1.7/week in adult CAPD patients [1].

Pediatric PD adequacy targets should be no lower than existing adult PD adequacy targets since generally, pediatric patients' greater metabolic demands require higher adequacy targets in terms of small solute clearance. No equivalent large scale clinical trials have been conducted in the pediatric peritoneal dialysis population but smaller scale observational studies support the association between delivered peritoneal dialysis dose and patient outcomes including the potential for improved growth [3].

1. Paniagua R, Amato D, Vonesh E, et al. "Effects of increased peritoneal clearances on mortality rates in peritoneal dialysis: ADEMEX, a prospective, randomized, controlled trial." Journal of the American Society of Nephrology: JASN (2002) 13:1307-20. PMID: 11961019.
2. Lo WK, Lui SL, Chan TM, et al. "Minimal and optimal peritoneal Kt/V targets: Results of an anuric peritoneal dialysis patient´s survival analysis." Kidney international (2005) 67:2032-8. PMID: 15840054.
3. Rees L, Feather S, Shroff R. "Peritoneal Dialysis Clinical Practice Guidelines for Children and Adolescents." British Association of Pediatric Nephrology (2008).

S.4. **Numerator Statement:** Number of patient months in the denominator in which delivered peritoneal dialysis dose was a weekly Kt/Vurea >= 1.8 (dialytic + residual, measured in the last 6 months)
S.6. **Denominator Statement:** To be included in the denominator for a particular reporting month, the patient must be on peritoneal dialysis for the entire month, be < 18 years old at the beginning of the month, must have had ESRD for greater than 90 days at the beginning of the month, and must be assigned to that facility for the entire month.
S.8. **Denominator Exclusions:** Exclusions that are implicit in the denominator definition include
1) Patients not on peritoneal dialysis for the entire month
2) Adult patients (>=18 years old)
3) All patients who have had ESRD for <91 days, and
4) Patients not assigned to the facility for the entire month

There are no additional exclusions for this measure.

De.1. **Measure Type:** Outcome: Intermediate Clinical Outcome
S.17. **Data Source:** Claims, Registry Data
S.20. **Level of Analysis:** Facility

IF Endorsement Maintenance – Original Endorsement Date: Oct 02, 2015 **Most Recent Endorsement Date:** Oct 02, 2015

IF this measure is included in a composite, NQF Composite#/title:

IF this measure is paired/grouped, NQF#/title:

De.4. **IF PAIRED/GROUPED, what is the reason this measure must be reported with other measures to appropriately interpret results?** N/A

1. Evidence, Performance Gap, Priority – Importance to Measure and Report

Extent to which the specific measure focus is evidence-based, important to making significant gains in healthcare quality, and improving health outcomes for a specific high-priority (high-impact) aspect of healthcare where there is variation in or overall less-than-optimal performance. ***Measures must be judged to meet all sub criteria to pass this criterion and be evaluated against the remaining criteria.***

1a. Evidence to Support the Measure Focus – See attached Evidence Submission Form
2706_Evidence.docx
1a.1 For Maintenance of Endorsement: Is there new evidence about the measure since the last update/submission?
Do not remove any existing information. If there have been any changes to evidence, the Committee will consider the new evidence. Please use the most current version of the evidence attachment (v7.1). Please use red font to indicate updated evidence.
No

1b. Performance Gap

Demonstration of quality problems and opportunity for improvement, i.e., data demonstrating:

- considerable variation, or overall less-than-optimal performance, in the quality of care across providers; and/or
- Disparities in care across population groups.

1b.1. **Briefly explain the rationale for this measure** *(e.g., how the measure will improve the quality of care, the benefits or improvements in quality envisioned by use of this measure)*
If a COMPOSITE (e.g., combination of component measure scores, all-or-none, any-or-none), SKIP this question and answer the composite questions.
The dose of dialysis is used to estimate the ability of peritoneal dialysis to clear the blood of accumulated toxins. In the adult population, outcome studies have shown an association between dose of hemodialysis in terms of small solute removal and clinical outcomes. Studies have shown a Kt/V of 1.8/week or greater in adult PD patients was associated with better serum albumin levels[1] and improved survival [2]. The ADEMEX did not show clinical benefit with in weekly Kt/V doses exceeding 1.7/week in adult CAPD patients [1].

Pediatric PD adequacy targets should be no lower than existing adult PD adequacy targets since generally, pediatric patients' greater metabolic demands require higher adequacy targets in terms of small solute clearance. No equivalent large scale clinical trials have been conducted in the pediatric peritoneal dialysis population but smaller scale observational studies support the association between delivered peritoneal dialysis dose and patient outcomes including the potential for improved growth [3].

1. Paniagua R, Amato D, Vonesh E, et al. "Effects of increased peritoneal clearances on mortality rates in peritoneal dialysis: ADEMEX, a prospective, randomized, controlled trial." Journal of the American Society of Nephrology: JASN (2002) 13:1307-20. PMID: 11961019.
2. Lo WK, Lui SL, Chan TM, et al. "Minimal and optimal peritoneal Kt/V targets: Results of an anuric peritoneal dialysis patient´s survival analysis." Kidney international (2005) 67:2032-8. PMID: 15840054.
3. Rees L, Feather S, Shroff R. "Peritoneal Dialysis Clinical Practice Guidelines for Children and Adolescents." British Association of Pediatric Nephrology (2008).

1b.2. **Provide performance scores on the measure as specified (current and over time) at the specified level of analysis**. *(This is required for maintenance of endorsement. Include mean, std dev, min, max, interquartile range, scores by decile. Describe the data source including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities include.) This information also will be used to address the sub-criterion on improvement (4b1) under Usability and Use.*
Analysis of CROWNWeb and Medicare Claims data from January 2017 to December 2017 found a total of 31 facilities with at least 11 eligible patients. The data indicated the mean percentage of pediatric patients with PD adequacy measurements that achieved the

target at least once in six months was 71.3% (SD=21.2%). Distribution: Min=17.5%, Max=95.3%, 25th percentile = 59.0%, 50th percentile =76.4%, 75th percentile = 88.3%. A description of the data is included in questions 1.1-1.7 under "Scientific Acceptability".

1b.3. **If no or limited performance data on the measure as specified is reported in 1b2, then provide a summary of data from the literature that indicates opportunity for improvement or overall less than optimal performance on the specific focus of measurement.**
N/A

1b.4. **Provide disparities data from the measure as specified (current and over time) by population group, e.g., by race/ethnicity, gender, age, insurance status, socioeconomic status, and/or disability.** *(This is required for maintenance of endorsement. Describe the data source including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities included.) For measures that show high levels of performance, i.e., "topped out", disparities data may demonstrate an opportunity for improvement/gap in care for certain sub-populations. This information also will be used to address the sub-criterion on improvement (4b1) under Usability and Use.*
Given that the number of facilities included in the calculation in 1b.2 is only 31, the sample was determined to be too small to display meaningful data to assess disparities.

1b.5. **If no or limited data on disparities from the measure as specified is reported in 1b.4, then provide a summary of data from the literature that addresses disparities in care on the specific focus of measurement. Include citations. Not necessary if performance data provided in 1b.4**
N/A

2. Reliability and Validity—Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties

Extent to which the measure, as specified, produces consistent (reliable) and credible (valid) results about the quality of care when implemented. ***Measures must be judged to meet the sub criteria for both reliability and validity to pass this criterion and be evaluated against the remaining criteria.***

2a.1. Specifications The measure is well defined and precisely specified so it can be implemented consistently within and across organizations and allows for comparability. eMeasures should be specified in the Health Quality Measures Format (HQMF) and the Quality Data Model (QDM).

De.5. **Subject/Topic Area** *(check all the areas that apply):*
Renal, Renal : End Stage Renal Disease (ESRD)

De.6. **Non-Condition Specific***(check all the areas that apply):*

De.7. **Target Population Category** *(Check all the populations for which the measure is specified and tested if any):*
Children, Populations at Risk

S.1. **Measure-specific Web Page** *(Provide a URL link to a web page specific for this measure that contains current detailed specifications including code lists, risk model details, and supplemental materials. Do not enter a URL linking to a home page or to general information.)*
N/A

S.2a. **If this is an eMeasure**, HQMF specifications must be attached. Attach the zipped output from the eMeasure authoring tool (MAT) - if the MAT was not used, contact staff. (Use the specification fields in this online form for the plain-language description of the specifications)
This is not an eMeasure **Attachment:**

S.2b. **Data Dictionary, Code Table, or Value Sets** *(and risk model codes and coefficients when applicable) must be attached. (Excel or csv file in the suggested format preferred - if not, contact staff)*
Attachment **Attachment:** 2706_Code_List.xlsx

S.2c. Is this an instrument-based measure (i.e., data collected via instruments, surveys, tools, questionnaires, scales, etc.)? Attach copy of instrument if available.
No, this is not an instrument-based measure **Attachment:**

S.2d. Is this an instrument-based measure (i.e., data collected via instruments, surveys, tools, questionnaires, scales, etc.)? Attach copy of instrument if available.
Not an instrument-based measure

S.3.1. **For maintenance of endorsement:** Are there changes to the specifications since the last updates/submission. If yes, update the specifications for S1-2 and S4-22 and explain reasons for the changes in S3.2.
No

S.3.2. **For maintenance of endorsement,** please briefly describe any important changes to the measure specifications since last measure update and explain the reasons.
There have been no changes to the measure specifications since the last endorsement in 2015.

S.4. **Numerator Statement** *(Brief, narrative description of the measure focus or what is being measured about the target population, i.e., cases from the target population with the target process, condition, event, or outcome) DO NOT include the rationale for the measure.*
IF an OUTCOME MEASURE, state the outcome being measured. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm (S.14).
Number of patient months in the denominator in which delivered peritoneal dialysis dose was a weekly Kt/Vurea >= 1.8 (dialytic + residual, measured in the last 6 months)

S.5. **Numerator Details** *(All information required to identify and calculate the cases from the target population with the target process, condition, event, or outcome such as definitions, time period for data collection, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b)*
IF an OUTCOME MEASURE, describe how the observed outcome is identified/counted. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm (S.14).
Reporting months with weekly Kt/Vurea >=1.8 (dialytic + residual) are counted in the numerator. If no weekly Kt/Vurea value is reported for a given patient in the reporting month, the most recent peritoneal dialysis weekly Kt/Vurea value in the prior 5 months is applied to the calculation for that month.

Missing, expired, and not performed are not counted as achieving the minimum weekly Kt/Vurea threshold.

If RRF is to be incorporated in the Kt/V calculation, this will be calculated using the urea clearance derived from 24 hour urine collection. Total body water (V) should be estimated by one of the following pediatric specific V approximation methods:
•Prediction equation based upon heavy water dilution
Males: TBW=0.10 (ht x wt)0.68 – 0.37 (wt)
Females: TBW=0.14 (ht x wt) 0.64 – 0.35 (wt)

•Simplified V estimating equations derived from the above prediction equations:
Males: TBW=20.88 x BSA – 4.29
Females: TBW=16.92 x BSA – 1.81

•Sex specific normograms derived from the above prediction equations and published in KDOQI PD guidelines for the pediatric population update from 2006.

S.6. **Denominator Statement** *(Brief, narrative description of the target population being measured)*
To be included in the denominator for a particular reporting month, the patient must be on peritoneal dialysis for the entire month, be < 18 years old at the beginning of the month, must have had ESRD for greater than 90 days at the beginning of the month, and must be assigned to that facility for the entire month.

S.7. **Denominator Details** *(All information required to identify and calculate the target population/denominator such as definitions, time period for data collection, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b.)*
IF an OUTCOME MEASURE, describe how the target population is identified. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm (S.14).
A treatment history file is the data source for the denominator calculation used for the analyses supporting this submission. This file provides a complete history of the status, location, and dialysis treatment modality of an ESRD patient from the date of the first ESRD service until the patient dies or the data collection cutoff date is reached. For each patient, a new record is created each time he/she changes facility or treatment modality. Each record represents a time period associated with a specific modality and dialysis facility. CROWNWeb is the primary basis for placing patients at dialysis facilities and dialysis claims are used as an additional source of information in certain situations. Information regarding first ESRD service date, death, and transplant is obtained from CROWNWeb (including the CMS Medical Evidence Form (Form CMS-2728) and the Death Notification Form (Form CMS-2746)) and Medicare claims, as well as the Organ Procurement and Transplant Network (OPTN).

S.8. **Denominator Exclusions** *(Brief narrative description of exclusions from the target population)*
Exclusions that are implicit in the denominator definition include
1) Patients not on peritoneal dialysis for the entire month
2) Adult patients (>=18 years old)
3) All patients who have had ESRD for <91 days, and
4) Patients not assigned to the facility for the entire month

There are no additional exclusions for this measure.

S.9. **Denominator Exclusion Details** *(All information required to identify and calculate exclusions from the denominator such as definitions, time period for data collection, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b.)*
N/A

S.10. **Stratification Information** *(Provide all information required to stratify the measure results, if necessary, including the stratification variables, definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets, and the risk-model covariates and coefficients for the clinically-adjusted version of the measure when appropriate – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format with at S.2b.)*
N/A

S.11. **Risk Adjustment Type** (Select type. Provide specifications for risk stratification in measure testing attachment)
No risk adjustment or risk stratification
If other:

S.12. **Type of score:**
Rate/proportion
If other:

S.13. **Interpretation of Score** *(Classifies interpretation of score according to whether better quality is associated with a higher score, a lower score, a score falling within a defined interval, or a passing score)*
Better quality = Higher score

S.14. **Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic** (*Diagram or describe the calculation of the measure score as an ordered sequence of steps including identifying the target population; exclusions; cases meeting the target process, condition, event, or outcome; time period for data, aggregating data; risk adjustment; etc.)*
Denominator: For the reporting month, patients are included in the denominator if:
1. Patient modality is indicated as peritoneal dialysis during the entire month
2. Patient age as of the beginning of the reporting month is less than 18 years
3. Patient has had ESRD for greater than 90 days at the beginning of the month
4. Patient has been assigned to the facility for the entire month

Numerator:

For the reporting month, patients from the denominator are also included in the numerator if they have a weekly Kt/Vurea >= 1.8.

If no weekly Kt/Vurea value is reported for a given patient in a month, the most recent peritoneal dialysis weekly Kt/Vurea value in the prior 5 months is applied to the calculation for that month.

S.15. **Sampling** *(If measure is based on a sample, provide instructions for obtaining the sample and guidance on minimum sample size.)*
IF an instrument-based performance measure (e.g., PRO-PM), identify whether (and how) proxy responses are allowed.
N/A

S.16. **Survey/Patient-reported data** *(If measure is based on a survey or instrument, provide instructions for data collection and guidance on minimum response rate.)*
Specify calculation of response rates to be reported with performance measure results.
N/A

S.17. **Data Source** *(Check ONLY the sources for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED).*
If other, please describe in S.18.
Claims, Registry Data

S.18. **Data Source or Collection Instrument** *(Identify the specific data source/data collection instrument (e.g. name of database, clinical registry, collection instrument, etc., and describe how data are collected.)*
IF instrument-based, identify the specific instrument(s) and standard methods, modes, and languages of administration.
For the analyses supporting this submission, the measure is calculated using CROWNWeb as the primary data source for the Kt/V values used to determine the numerator. If a patient's Kt/V data are missing in CROWNWeb, Kt/V values from Medicare claims are used as an additional source for obtaining that information. Please see the attached data dictionary for a list of specific data elements that are used from each data source.

S.19. **Data Source or Collection Instrument** *(available at measure-specific Web page URL identified in S.1 OR in attached appendix at A.1)*
No data collection instrument provided

S.20. **Level of Analysis** *(Check ONLY the levels of analysis for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED)*
Facility

S.21. **Care Setting** *(Check ONLY the settings for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED)*
Other
If other: Dialysis Facility

S.22. **COMPOSITE Performance Measure** - Additional Specifications *(Use this section as needed for aggregation and weighting rules, or calculation of individual performance measures if not individually endorsed.)*
N/A

2. Validity – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form
2706_testing_.docx

2.1 For maintenance of endorsement
Reliability testing: If testing of reliability of the measure score was not presented in prior submission(s), has reliability testing of the measure score been conducted? If yes, please provide results in the Testing attachment. Please use the most current version of the testing attachment (v7.1). Include information on all testing conducted (prior testing as well as any new testing); use red font to indicate updated testing.
Yes

2.2 For maintenance of endorsement
Has additional empirical validity testing of the measure score been conducted? If yes, please provide results in the Testing attachment. Please use the most current version of the testing attachment (v7.1). Include information on all testing conducted (prior testing as well as any new testing); use red font to indicate updated testing.
Yes

2.3 For maintenance of endorsement

Risk adjustment: For outcome, resource use, cost, and some process measures, risk-adjustment that includes social risk factors is not prohibited at present. Please update sections 1.8, 2a2, 2b1,2b4.3 and 2b5 in the Testing attachment and S.140 and S.11 in the online submission form. NOTE: These sections must be updated even if social risk factors are not included in the risk-adjustment strategy. You MUST use the most current version of the Testing Attachment (v7.1) -- older versions of the form will not have all required questions.

No - This measure is not risk-adjusted

3. Feasibility

Extent to which the specifications including measure logic, require data that are readily available or could be captured without undue burden and can be implemented for performance measurement.

3a. Byproduct of Care Processes

For clinical measures, the required data elements are routinely generated and used during care delivery (e.g., blood pressure, lab test, diagnosis, medication order).

3a.1. **Data Elements Generated as Byproduct of Care Processes.**

Generated or collected by and used by healthcare personnel during the provision of care (e.g., blood pressure, lab value, diagnosis, depression score)

If other:

3b. Electronic Sources

The required data elements are available in electronic health records or other electronic sources. If the required data are not in electronic health records or existing electronic sources, a credible, near-term path to electronic collection is specified.

3b.1. **To what extent are the specified data elements available electronically in defined fields** (*i.e., data elements that are needed to compute the performance measure score are in defined, computer-readable fields*) Update this field for **maintenance of endorsement**.

ALL data elements are in defined fields in a combination of electronic sources

3b.2. **If ALL the data elements needed to compute the performance measure score are not from electronic sources, specify a credible, near-term path to electronic capture, OR provide a rationale for using other than electronic sources.** For **maintenance of endorsement**, if this measure is not an eMeasure (eCQM), please describe any efforts to develop an eMeasure (eCQM).

3b.3. **If this is an eMeasure, provide a summary of the feasibility assessment in an attached file or make available at a measure-specific URL. Please also complete and attach the NQF Feasibility Score Card.**

Attachment:

3c. Data Collection Strategy

Demonstration that the data collection strategy (e.g., source, timing, frequency, sampling, patient confidentiality, costs associated with fees/licensing of proprietary measures) can be implemented (e.g., already in operational use, or testing demonstrates that it is ready to put into operational use). For eMeasures, a feasibility assessment addresses the data elements and measure logic and demonstrates the eMeasure can be implemented or feasibility concerns can be adequately addressed.

3c.1. **Required for maintenance of endorsement. Describe difficulties (as a result of testing and/or operational use of the measure) regarding data collection, availability of data, missing data, timing and frequency of data collection, sampling, patient confidentiality, time and cost of data collection, other feasibility/implementation issues.**

IF instrument-based, consider implications for both individuals providing data (patients, service recipients, respondents) and those whose performance is being measured.

Data collection is accomplished via CROWNWeb, a web-based and electronic batch submission platform maintained and operated by CMS contractors. Measures reported on DFC are reviewed on a regular basis by dialysis facility providers and rare instances of inaccurate or missing data are present based on comments reported in the DFC ticketing system.

3c.2. **Describe any fees, licensing, or other requirements to use any aspect of the measure as specified** *(e.g., value/code set, risk model, programming code, algorithm)*.
N/A

4. Usability and Use

Extent to which potential audiences (e.g., consumers, purchasers, providers, policy makers) are using or could use performance results for both accountability and performance improvement to achieve the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

4a. Accountability and Transparency

Performance results are used in at least one accountability application within three years after initial endorsement and are publicly reported within six years after initial endorsement (or the data on performance results are available). If not in use at the time of initial endorsement, then a credible plan for implementation within the specified timeframes is provided.

4.1. **Current and Planned Use**

NQF-endorsed measures are expected to be used in at least one accountability application within 3 years and publicly reported within 6 years of initial endorsement in addition to performance improvement.

Specific Plan for Use	Current Use (for current use provide URL)
	Public Reporting ESRD QIP http://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Initiatives-Patient-Assessment-Instruments/ESRDQIP/ Payment Program http://www.medicare.gov/dialysisfacilitycompare/ Dialysis Facility Compare

4a1.1 **For each CURRENT use, checked above (update for maintenance of endorsement), provide:**

- Name of program and sponsor
- Purpose
- Geographic area and number and percentage of accountable entities and patients included
- Level of measurement and setting

DFC:
Purpose: Dialysis Facility Compare helps patients find detailed information about Medicare-certified dialysis facilities. They can compare the services and the quality of care that facilities provide.
Geographic area: United States
Number of accountable entities: All Medicare-certified dialysis facilities who are eligible for the measure, and have at least 11 patients (due to public reporting requirements). For the most recent update to Dialysis Facility Compare (January 2019), 34 facilities had a score reported.
Patients included: All patients who meet the requirements to be included in the measure.

QIP:
Purpose: The ESRD QIP will reduce payments to ESRD facilities that do not meet or exceed certain performance standards. The measure was added to the program for PY2018. In PY2019, the QIP began reporting a comprehensive Kt/V measure, for which this the data used in this measure is counted. For the purposes of this review, we are considering this an active implementation of this measure.
Geographic area: United States
Number of accountable entities: All Medicare-certified dialysis facilities who are eligible for the measure, and have at least 11 patients (due to public reporting requirements). For the most recent QIP report (PY 2019), this was 6835 facilities. Since the QIP

reports a comprehensive Kt/V measure, the number of facilities counted here is larger than for DFC.

4a1.2. **If not currently publicly reported OR used in at least one other accountability application (e.g., payment program, certification, licensing) what are the reasons?** (*e.g., Do policies or actions of the developer/steward or accountable entities restrict access to performance results or impede implementation?*)
N/A

4a1.3. **If not currently publicly reported OR used in at least one other accountability application, provide a credible plan for implementation within the expected timeframes -- any accountability application within 3 years and publicly reported within 6 years of initial endorsement.** (*Credible plan includes the specific program, purpose, intended audience, and timeline for implementing the measure within the specified timeframes. A plan for accountability applications addresses mechanisms for data aggregation and reporting.*)
N/A

4a2.1.1. **Describe how performance results, data, and assistance with interpretation have been provided to those being measured or other users during development or implementation.**
How many and which types of measured entities and/or others were included? If only a sample of measured entities were included, describe the full population and how the sample was selected.
Results of this measure are currently reported on Dialysis Facility Compare and in the ESRD Quality Incentive Program (via the comprehensive Kt/V measure described above). All Medicare-certified dialysis facilities are eligible for reporting in both programs (approximately 7,000 dialysis facilities). Each program has a helpdesk and supporting documentation available to assist with interpretation of the measure results.

The measure developer (UM-KECC) produces and distributes the DFC data under contract with CMS. Other CMS contractors calculate and distribute the ESRD QIP measure results.

4a2.1.2. **Describe the process(es) involved, including when/how often results were provided, what data were provided, what educational/explanatory efforts were made, etc.**
For DFC, the results are first reported to facilities via a closed preview period, where facilities can review their data prior to each of the quarterly updates of the public facing Dialysis Facility Compare website. These preview reports are posted on dialysisdata.org, where facilities can also find a detailed Guide to the Quarterly Dialysis Facility Compare Reports and other supporting documentation. Facilities can submit comments/questions about their results at any time, and can request patient lists for their facilities during the specified preview periods.

For the ESRD QIP, results are first reported to facilities via closed preview period on an annual basis; facilities can review their data prior to the results becoming public at the end of the calendar year. These preview reports are posted on qualitynet.org, where facilities can also find supporting documentation and can submit comments/questions about their results.

A measures manual that describes the calculations for both of these programs in detail is published on the CMS website: https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Initiatives-Patient-Assessment-Instruments/ESRDQIP/06_MeasuringQuality.html

4a2.2.1. **Summarize the feedback on measure performance and implementation from the measured entities and others described in 4d.1.**
Describe how feedback was obtained.
For DFC, feedback can be provided any time through contacting the dialysisdata.org helpdesk. Preview periods allow for specific times for facilities review and comment on measure calculations, and provide an opportunity to request a patient list.

For the ESRD QIP, feedback can be provided any time through contacting the QIP helpdesk. Preview periods allow for specific times for facilities review and comment on measure calculations. Comments can also be submitted in response to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for each QIP payment year.

4a2.2.2. **Summarize the feedback obtained from those being measured.**
We reviewed the comments and questions submitted during the DFC preview periods that have taken place since the last maintenance (2016-present). Outside of questions about facility-specific results (such as questioning the Kt/V value on record for a particular patient), we receive a handful of questions each preview period regarding the measure specifications, such as the

determination of dialysis modality.

Note that since UM-KECC is not the contractor responsible for the ESRD Quality Incentive Program, we do not have access to the detailed comments/requested that are submitted during the annual preview period for that program.

4a2.2.3. **Summarize the feedback obtained from other users**
We reviewed the public comments that were addressed in the ESRD QIP Final Rules (FRs) that have been published since the last endorsement (PY2019 – PY2022). Since PY 2019, the ESRD QIP has been reporting a combined Kt/V measure in order to allow for more reporting of data for pediatric and peritoneal dialysis patients. Most of the comments addressed in the rule have to do with that decision. In the FR for PY 2019, there were also a number of questions about how the combined measure would be specified that were along similar lines to what is often asked via the DFC preview period.

4a2.3. **Describe how the feedback described in 4a2.2.1 has been considered when developing or revising the measure specifications or implementation, including whether the measure was modified and why or why not.**
The measure specifications have not been revised since the last maintenance cycle in 2015. Feedback received during DFC preview periods has resulted in more detailed and accurate documentation available to the public, primarily via the ESRD Measures Manual and the Guide to the Quarterly Dialysis Facility Reports.

Improvement
Progress toward achieving the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations is demonstrated. If not in use for performance improvement at the time of initial endorsement, then a credible rationale describes how the performance results could be used to further the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

4b1. **Refer to data provided in 1b but do not repeat here. Discuss any progress on improvement (trends in performance results, number and percentage of people receiving high-quality healthcare; Geographic area and number and percentage of accountable entities and patients included.)**
If no improvement was demonstrated, what are the reasons? If not in use for performance improvement at the time of initial endorsement, provide a credible rationale that describes how the performance results could be used to further the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.
The following reports the performance scores for this measure at the yearly level for 2015 - 2017. This analysis demonstrates an increase in performance across three years for the measure as implemented on DFC.

Year 2015: N = 27, Mean = 55.6%, Std Dev =29.7%, Min = 3.6%, Max = 97.3%
Year 2016: N = 30, Mean =60.6%, Std Dev = 26.9%, Min = 7%, Max = 95.8%
Year 2017: N = 31, Mean = 71.3%, Std Dev = 17.5%, Min = 17.5%, Max = 95.3%

4b2. Unintended Consequences
The benefits of the performance measure in facilitating progress toward achieving high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to individuals or populations (if such evidence exists).

4b2.1. **Please explain any unexpected findings (positive or negative) during implementation of this measure including unintended impacts on patients.**
We have been encouraged by the magnitude of improvement in measure results after implementation noted in 4b1 above.
We have not been notified of documented unintended impacts on patients as a result of measure implementation.

4b2.2. **Please explain any unexpected benefits from implementation of this measure.**
None that we are aware of, other than facility improvements over the last three reporting periods as noted in 4b1 and commented on in 4b2.1

5. Comparison to Related or Competing Measures

If a measure meets the above criteria and there are endorsed or new related measures (either the same measure focus or the same target population) or competing measures (both the same measure focus and the same target population), the measures are compared to address harmonization and/or selection of the best measure.

5. Relation to Other NQF-endorsed Measures
Are there related measures (conceptually, either same measure focus or target population) or competing measures (conceptually both the same measure focus and same target population)? If yes, list the NQF # and title of all related and/or competing measures.
No

5.1a. **List of related or competing measures (selected from NQF-endorsed measures)**

5.1b. **If related or competing measures are not NQF endorsed please indicate measure title and steward.**

5a. Harmonization of Related Measures
The measure specifications are harmonized with related measures;
OR
The differences in specifications are justified

5a.1. **If this measure conceptually addresses EITHER the same measure focus OR the same target population as NQF-endorsed measure(s):**
Are the measure specifications harmonized to the extent possible?

5a.2. **If the measure specifications are not completely harmonized, identify the differences, rationale, and impact on interpretability and data collection burden.**

5b. Competing Measures
The measure is superior to competing measures (e.g., is a more valid or efficient way to measure);
OR
Multiple measures are justified.

5b.1. **If this measure conceptually addresses both the same measure focus and the same target population as NQF-endorsed measure(s):**
Describe why this measure is superior to competing measures (e.g., a more valid or efficient way to measure quality); OR provide a rationale for the additive value of endorsing an additional measure. (Provide analyses when possible.)

Appendix

A.1 Supplemental materials may be provided in an appendix. All supplemental materials (such as data collection instrument or methodology reports) should be organized in one file with a table of contents or bookmarks. If material pertains to a specific submission form number, that should be indicated. Requested information should be provided in the submission form and required attachments. There is no guarantee that supplemental materials will be reviewed.
No appendix **Attachment:**

Contact Information

Co.1 **Measure Steward (Intellectual Property Owner):** Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
Co.2 **Point of Contact:** Helen, Dollar-Maples, Helen.Dollar-Maples@cms.hhs.gov, 410-786-7214-
Co.3 **Measure Developer if different from Measure Steward:** University of Michigan Kidney Epidemiology and Cost Center
Co.4 **Point of Contact:** Casey, Parrotte, parrotte@med.umich.edu

Additional Information

Ad.1 **Workgroup/Expert Panel involved in measure development**
Provide a list of sponsoring organizations and workgroup/panel members' names and organizations. Describe the members' role in measure development.

Measure Developer/Steward Updates and Ongoing Maintenance

Ad.2 **Year the measure was first released:** 2015

Ad.3 **Month and Year of most recent revision:** 04, 2019

Ad.4 **What is your frequency for review/update of this measure?** Annually

Ad.5 **When is the next scheduled review/update for this measure?** 04, 2020

Ad.6 **Copyright statement:** N/A

Ad.7 **Disclaimers:** N/A

Ad.8 **Additional Information/Comments:**

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM—Evidence (subcriterion 1a)

Measure Number (*if previously endorsed*)**:** 2706
Measure Title: Pediatric Peritoneal Dialysis Adequacy: Achievement of Target Kt/V
IF the measure is a component in a composite performance measure, provide the title of the Composite Measure here: Click here to enter composite measure #/ title
Date of Submission: 4/2/2019

Instructions

- *Complete 1a.1 and 1a.2 for all measures. If instrument-based measure, complete 1a.3.*
- *Complete **EITHER 1a.2, 1a.3 or 1a.4** as applicable for the type of measure and evidence.*
- *For composite performance measures:*
  - *A separate evidence form is required for each component measure unless several components were studied together.*
  - *If a component measure is submitted as an individual performance measure, attach the evidence form to the individual measure submission.*
- All information needed to demonstrate meeting the evidence subcriterion (1a) must be in this form. An appendix of *supplemental* materials may be submitted, but there is no guarantee it will be reviewed.
- If you are unable to check a box, please highlight or shade the box for your response.
- Contact NQF staff regarding questions. Check for resources at Submitting Standards webpage.

Note: The information provided in this form is intended to aid the Standing Committee and other stakeholders in understanding to what degree the evidence for this measure meets NQF's evaluation criteria.

1a. Evidence to Support the Measure Focus

The measure focus is evidence-based, demonstrated as follows:

- Outcome: [3] Empirical data demonstrate a relationship between the outcome and at least one healthcare structure, process, intervention, or service. If not available, wide variation in performance can be used as evidence, assuming the data are from a robust number of providers and results are not subject to systematic bias.
- Intermediate clinical outcome: a systematic assessment and grading of the quantity, quality, and consistency of the body of evidence [4] that the measured intermediate clinical outcome leads to a desired health outcome.
- Process: [5] a systematic assessment and grading of the quantity, quality, and consistency of the body of evidence [4] that the measured process leads to a desired health outcome.
- Structure: a systematic assessment and grading of the quantity, quality, and consistency of the body of evidence [4] that the measured structure leads to a desired health outcome.
- Efficiency: [6] evidence not required for the resource use component.
- For measures derived from patient reports, evidence should demonstrate that the target population values the measured outcome, process, or structure and finds it meaningful.
- Process measures incorporating Appropriate Use Criteria: See NQF's guidance for evidence for measures, in general; guidance for measures specifically based on clinical practice guidelines apply as well.

Notes

3. Generally, rare event outcomes do not provide adequate information for improvement or discrimination; however, serious reportable events that are compared to zero are appropriate outcomes for public reporting and quality improvement.

4. The preferred systems for grading the evidence are the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) guidelines and/or modified GRADE.

5. Clinical care processes typically include multiple steps: assess → identify problem/potential problem → choose/plan intervention (with patient input) → provide intervention → evaluate impact on health status. If the measure focus is one

step in such a multistep process, the step with the strongest evidence for the link to the desired outcome should be selected as the focus of measurement. Note: A measure focused only on collecting PROM data is not a PRO-PM.
6. Measures of efficiency combine the concepts of resource use and quality (see NQF's Measurement Framework: Evaluating Efficiency Across Episodes of Care; AQA Principles of Efficiency Measures).

1a.1.This is a measure of: (*should be consistent with type of measure entered in De.1*)
Outcome

☐ Outcome: Click here to name the health outcome

☐ Patient-reported outcome (PRO): Click here to name the PRO

PROs include HRQoL/functional status, symptom/symptom burden, experience with care, health-related behaviors. (*A PRO-based performance measure is not a survey instrument. Data may be collected using a survey instrument to construct a PRO measure.)*

☒ Intermediate clinical outcome (*e.g., lab value*): Kt/V

☐ Process: Click here to name what is being measured

☐ Appropriate use measure: Click here to name what is being measured

☐ Structure: Click here to name the structure

☐ Composite: Click here to name what is being measured

1a.2 LOGIC MODEL Diagram or briefly describe the steps between the healthcare structures and processes (e.g., interventions, or services) and the patient's health outcome(s). The relationships in the diagram should be easily understood by general, non-technical audiences. Indicate the structure, process or outcome being measured.

Dialysis dose is an intermediate clinical outcome. The link is intermediate health outcome-health outcome. The dose of dialysis is used to estimate the ability of peritoneal dialysis to clear the blood of accumulated toxins. In the adult population, outcome studies have shown an association between dose of hemodialysis in terms of small solute removal and clinical outcomes. Studies have shown a Kt/V of 1.8/week or greater in adult PD patients was associated with better serum albumin levels and improved survival.
Pediatric PD adequacy targets should be no lower than existing adult PD adequacy targets since generally, pediatric patients' greater metabolic demands require higher adequacy targets in terms of small solute clearance. No equivalent large scale clinical trials have been conducted in the pediatric peritoneal dialysis population but smaller scale observational studies support the association between delivered peritoneal dialysis dose and patient outcomes including the potential for improved growth.

1a.3 Value and Meaningfulness: IF this measure is derived from patient report, provide evidence that the target population values the measured ***outcome, process, or structure*** and finds it meaningful. (Describe how and from whom their input was obtained.)

N/A

****RESPOND TO ONLY ONE SECTION BELOW -EITHER 1a.2, 1a.3 or 1a.4) ****

1a.2 FOR OUTCOME MEASURES including PATIENT REPORTED OUTCOMES - Provide empirical data demonstrating the relationship between the outcome (or PRO) to at least one healthcare structure, process, intervention, or service.

N/A

1a.3. SYSTEMATIC REVIEW(SR) OF THE EVIDENCE (for INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME, PROCESS, OR STRUCTURE PERFORMANCE MEASURES, INCLUDING THOSE THAT ARE INSTRUMENT-BASED) If the evidence is not based on a systematic review go to section 1a.4) If you wish to include more than one systematic review, add additional tables.

What is the source of the systematic review of the body of evidence that supports the performance measure? A systematic review is a scientific investigation that focuses on a specific question and uses explicit, prespecified scientific methods to identify, select, assess, and summarize the findings of similar but separate studies. It may include a quantitative synthesis (meta-analysis), depending on the available data. (IOM)

X Clinical Practice Guideline recommendation (with evidence review)

☐ US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation

☐ Other systematic review and grading of the body of evidence (*e.g., Cochrane Collaboration, AHRQ Evidence Practice Center*)

☐ Other

Source of Systematic Review: • **Title** • **Author** • **Date** • **Citation, including page number** • **URL**	National Kidney Foundation. KDOQI Clinical Practice Guidelines and Clinical Practice Recommendations for 2006 Updates: Hemodialysis Adequacy, Peritoneal Dialysis Adequacy and Vascular Access. Am J Kidney Dis 48:S1-S322, 2006 (suppl 1). http://www2.kidney.org/professionals/KDOQI/guideline_upHD_PD_VA/pd_rec6.htm
Quote the guideline or recommendation verbatim about the process, structure or intermediate outcome being measured. If not a guideline, summarize the conclusions from the SR.	"6.3.2.1 The minimal "delivered" dose of total (peritoneal and kidney) small-solute clearance should be a Kt/Vurea of at least 1.8/wk" "For areas in which no pediatric-specific data exist, the CPGs and CPRs for adult patients should serve as a minimum standard for pediatric patients, but the overall clinical "wellness" of the individual pediatric patient should be the primary factor that influences the quantity and quality of the care provided."

Grade assigned to the **evidence** associated with the recommendation with the definition of the grade	N/A
Provide all other grades and definitions from the evidence grading system	N/A
Grade assigned to the **recommendation** with definition of the grade	N/A
Provide all other grades and definitions from the recommendation grading system	N/A
Body of evidence: • Quantity – how many studies? • Quality – what type of studies?	N/A
Estimates of benefit and consistency across studies	N/A
What harms were identified?	N/A
Identify any new studies conducted since the SR. Do the new studies change the conclusions from the SR?	The number of published clinical studies in the pediatric population is very small and includes small numbers of patients. PD adequacy studies among the pediatric population are largely observational studies; large scale clinical trials do not exist in the pediatric PD population because of the low prevalence of stage 5 CKD among pediatric patients, high transplantation rate, and difficulty of determining measurable study end points. Therefore, outcomes from the adult PD adequacy studies are evaluated, as experts agree that pediatric PD adequacy targets should be no lower than existing adult PD adequacy targets since generally, pediatric patients' greater metabolic demands require higher adequacy targets in terms of small solute clearance. Studies in the adult population and the small number of studies in the pediatric population generally support the relationship between improved solute clearance and clinical outcomes. The evidence supports a target Kt/V for peritoneal dialysis adequacy of between 1.7 and 1.8/week. There is evidence to support that the higher metabolic demands for growth in the pediatric population may require dialysis targets that are at least equal if not higher than in the adult population. There are no specific clinical studies evaluating frequency of adequacy measurements. However, dialysis adequacy

	would need to be measured in order to ensure that target adequacy doses are achieved. The 2013 clinical TEP reviewed 30-40 studies on peritoneal dialysis adequacy for both the adult and pediatric populations. PD adequacy studies among the pediatric population are largely observational studies; large scale clinical trials do not exist in the pediatric PD population because of the low prevalence of stage 5 CKD among pediatric patients, high transplantation rate, and difficulty of determining measurable study end points. These include studies on solute clearance and clinical outcomes (such as the ADEMEX), the method of measurement of volume in the pediatric population (Morgenstern, et al. JASN 17:285-293, 2006), the importance of measurement of residual renal function (CANUSA study, Bargman JM, et al. JASN 2158-2162, 2001) and the importance of growth as an outcome measure in the pediatric population (Chadha V, et al. PDI 2001), among others. In May 2014, an additional literature search was performed and additional pieces of evidence [11-14] are included in the citations below as a result of that search. 1. Paniagua R, Amato D, Vonesh E, et al. "Effects of increased peritoneal clearances on mortality rates in peritoneal dialysis: ADEMEX, a prospective, randomized, controlled trial." Journal of the American Society of Nephrology: JASN (2002) 13:1307-20. PMID: 11961019. Abstract: Small-solute clearance targets for peritoneal dialysis (PD) have been based on the tacit assumption that peritoneal and renal clearances are equivalent and therefore additive. Although several studies have established that patient survival is directly correlated with

	renal clearances, there have been no randomized, controlled, interventional trials examining the effects of increases in peritoneal small-solute clearances on patient survival. A prospective, randomized, controlled, clinical trial was performed to study the effects of increased peritoneal small-solute clearances on clinical outcomes among patients with end-stage renal disease who were being treated with PD. A total of 965 subjects were randomly assigned to the intervention or control group (in a 1:1 ratio). Subjects in the control group continued to receive their preexisting PD prescriptions, which consisted of four daily exchanges with 2 L of standard PD solution. The subjects in the intervention group were treated with a modified prescription, to achieve a peritoneal creatinine clearance (pCrCl) of 60 L/wk per 1.73 m(2). The primary endpoint was death. The minimal follow-up period was 2 yr. The study groups were similar with respect to demographic characteristics, causes of renal disease, prevalence of coexisting conditions, residual renal function, peritoneal clearances before intervention, hematocrit values, and multiple indicators of nutritional status. In the control group, peritoneal creatinine clearance (pCrCl) and peritoneal urea clearance (Kt/V) values remained constant for the duration of the study. In the intervention group, pCrCl and peritoneal Kt/V values

	predictably increased and remained separated from the values for the control group for the entire duration of the study ($P < 0.01$). Patient survival was similar for the control and intervention groups in an intent-to-treat analysis, with a relative risk of death (intervention/control) of 1.00 [95% confidence interval (CI), 0.80 to 1.24]. Overall, the control group exhibited a 1-yr survival of 85.5% (CI, 82.2 to 88.7%) and a 2-yr survival of 68.3% (CI, 64.2 to 72.9%). Similarly, the intervention group exhibited a 1-yr survival of 83.9% (CI, 80.6 to 87.2%) and a 2-yr survival of 69.3% (CI, 65.1 to 73.6%). An as-treated analysis revealed similar results (overall relative risk = 0.93; CI, 0.71 to 1.22; $P = 0.6121$). Mortality rates for the two groups remained similar even after adjustment for factors known to be associated with survival for patients undergoing PD (e.g., age, diabetes mellitus, serum albumin levels, normalized protein equivalent of total nitrogen appearance, and anuria). This study provides evidence that increases in peritoneal small-solute clearances within the range studied have a neutral effect on patient survival, even when the groups are stratified according to a variety of factors (age, diabetes mellitus, serum albumin levels, normalized protein equivalent of total nitrogen appearance, and anuria) known to affect survival. No clear survival advantage was obtained with increases in peritoneal small-solute clearances within the

	range achieved in this study. 2. Lo WK, Lui SL, Chan TM, et al. “Minimal and optimal peritoneal Kt/V targets: Results of an anuric peritoneal dialysis patient's survival analysis.” Kidney international (2005) 67:2032-8. PMID: 15840054 BACKGROUND: Residual renal clearance has been shown to be much more predictive of survival than peritoneal clearance. There has been little data to support a target level of peritoneal clearance. A retrospective study was therefore conducted to see how the peritoneal Kt/V had affected the survival of anuric patients in our center. METHODS: Over a period of 10 years, there were 150 peritoneal dialysis patients with documented anuria. Their survival was analyzed according to their baseline peritoneal Kt/V at the time of documentation of anuria and at the time of their latest altered peritoneal dialysis (PD) prescription (subsequent Kt/V). RESULTS: There were 90 females and 42 diabetics. The mean age and duration of dialysis were 57.7 +/- 14.7 and 44.1 +/- 31.3 months, respectively. The 2-year and 5-year survival rates were 88.7% and 66.7%, respectively. We found that patients with baseline peritoneal Kt/V below 1.67 had poorer survival after the documentation of anuria than those above [relative risk (RR) 1.985, P=

	0.01], although the baseline Kt/V was not an independent risk factors in the whole group of patients. However, such effect was mainly observed in female patients. The survival was identical between those with Kt/V above or below 1.80 (P= 0.98). Among female patients, the group with baseline Kt/V 1.67 to 1.86 had the best survival, followed by those greater than 1.86 and lowest in those below 1.67 (P= 0.0016). For patients with baseline Kt/V below 1.80, those with subsequent Kt/V above 1.76 had better survival than those below (P= 0.033). CONCLUSION: Our data suggested that a negative effect of peritoneal Kt/V on survival is apparent at a level below 1.67 and there exists a limit of its effect at around 1.80. We suggested a minimal Kt/V target of 1.70 and an optimal target at 1.80 in anuric patients based on survival data. Prospective randomized study is required to confirm this finding. 3. Holtta T, Ronnholm K, Jalanko H, Holmberg C. "Clinical outcome of pediatric patients on peritoneal dialysis under adequacy control." Pediatric Nephrology (2000) 14: 889-97. PMID: 10975294 Abstract: Clinical outcome under adequacy control was studied in 10 pediatric patients under 5 years and 11 patients over 5 years of age on continuous peritoneal dialysis (PD). Outcome

	was compared between the age groups and with our previous results in patients under 5 years of age. Peritoneal equilibration test and 24-h dialysate collection were performed. Laboratory data, clinical status, and diet were recorded. PD prescription was adjusted for these parameters. The mean weekly urea Kt/V was similar and stable in the two age groups (3.1+/-0.6 vs. 3.2+/-0.4 at baseline). The mean weekly creatinine clearance (C(Cr)) was at baseline significantly lower in the younger age group (58.7+/-11.9 vs. 78.0+/-14.9 l/week per 1.73 m2, P=0.004), but later similar. Urea Kt/V and C(Cr) correlated significantly. Hematological and biochemical parameters were stable, and catch-up growth was observed in 62% of the patients during 9 months of follow-up. The outcome for children under and over 5 years of age did not differ significantly. The clinical outcome in patients under 5 years of age improved under adequacy control, when compared with our previous results in patients of the same age. This suggests a positive effect of adequacy control on clinical outcome. 4. National Kidney Foundation. KDOQI Clinical Practice Guidelines and Clinical Practice Recommendations for 2006 Updates: Hemodialysis Adequacy,

Peritoneal Dialysis Adequacy and Vascular Access. Am J Kidney Dis 48:S1-S322, 2006 (suppl 1).

5. Rees L, Feather S, Shroff R. "Peritoneal Dialysis Clinical Practice Guidelines for Children and Adolescents." British Association of Pediatric Nephrology (2008).

6. White CT, Gowrishankar M, Feber J et al. "Clinical practice guidelines for pediatric peritoneal dialysis." Pediatric Nephrology: (2006) 21: 1059-66. PMID: 16819641\

Abstract: Peritoneal dialysis (PD) continues to be an important modality of treatment for children with end-stage renal disease. The Canadian Association of Pediatric Nephrologists recognized the need nationally to review the literature on the delivery of PD in children to provide optimal standardized care. This resulted in the development of the Canadian Clinical Practice Guidelines for pediatric PD. Clinical practice guidelines are a useful adjunct to clinical care. The present review includes recommendations for catheter placement and types, requirement for prophylactic omentectomy, initiation and adequacy of dialysis, PD prescription, and solute clearance. It provides physicians with updated evidence-based

	recommendations that include consideration towards practicality with the major goal of improved and standardized patient care. 7. European Best Practice Guideline Working Group. “European Best Practice Guidelines for Peritoneal Dialysis.” Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation (2005) 20:ix1-ix37. 8. Chadha V, Blowey DL, Warady BA. “Is growth a valid outcome measure of dialysis clearance in children undergoing peritoneal dialysis?” Peritoneal dialysis international : journal of the International Society for Peritoneal Dialysis (2001) 21 Suppl 3:S179-84. PMID: 11887816 OBJECTIVE: Our study evaluated growth as a clinical outcome measure of peritoneal dialysis (PD) adequacy in children with end-stage renal disease (ESRD). DESIGN: This retrospective single-center study was carried out in our tertiary-care medical center. PATIENTS: The study enrolled 24 patients who initiated dialysis after January 1, 1995, and who had been on dialysis for a minimum of 1 year. RESULTS: The weekly mean total [PD + residual renal function (RRF)] creatinine clearance (C(Cr)) and Kt/V(urea) were 70.3 +/- 18 L per 1.73 m2 and 3.45

	+/- 0.73, respectively. Of the 24 patients, 12 (50%) were anuric. The mean height standard deviation score (SDS) changed to -1.78 at the end of 1 year from -1.58 at baseline. Catch-up growth (positive delta height SDS) was observed in 9 patients (37%), 7 of whom (78%) had residual renal function (RRF). In contrast, only 5 of 15 patients (33%) with a negative deltaSDS for height had RRF ($p < 0.025$). The mean height SDS in patients with RRF improved to -1.64 from -1.78; in patients without RRF, it worsened to -1.90 from -1.37 ($p = 0.01$). While the weekly total Kt/V(urea) in patients with RRF (3.53) was similar to that in patients without RRF (3.37, $p = 0.6$), only the native Kt/V(urea) had a significant (but weak) positive correlation with delta height SDS ($r2 = 0.17$, $p = 0.04$). In contrast, the total weekly C(Cr) was significantly higher ($p = 0.001$) in patients with RRF (81.1 L/1.73 m2) as compared with those without RRF (59.5 L/1.73 m2). However, only the native C(Cr)--and not the dialysis C(Cr)--had a significant (but weak) positive correlation with delta height SDS ($r2 = 0.17$, $p = 0.04$). CONCLUSIONS: These preliminary data provide evidence for a correlation between solute clearance and growth, with RRF exerting a significant influence on that outcome. The Kt/V(urea) data also appear to contradict the presumed equivalence of PD and native clearance in children with

	ESRD 9. Morgenstern BZ, Wuhl E, Nair KS, Warady BA, et al. “Anthropometric prediction of total body water in children who are on pediatric peritoneal dialysis.” Journal of the American Society of Nephrology: JASN (2006) 17:285-93. PMID: 16319190 Abstract: Accurate estimation of total body water (TBW) is a critical component of dialysis prescription in peritoneal dialysis (PD). Gold-standard isotope dilution techniques are laborious and costly; therefore, anthropometric prediction equations that are based on height and weight are commonly used to estimate TBW. Equations have been established in healthy populations, but their validity is unclear in children who undergo PD, in whom altered states of hydration and other confounding alterations in normal physiology, particularly retarded growth and pubertal delay, may exist. TBW was measured by heavy water (H2O18 or D2O) dilution in 64 pediatric patients who were aged 1 mo to 23 yr and receiving chronic PD in the United States and Germany to establish and validate population-specific anthropometric TBW prediction equations and to compare the predictive power of these equations with formulas that have been established in healthy children. The best-fitting

	equations are as follows: For boys, TBW = 0.10 x (HtWt)0.68 - 0.37 x weight; for girls, TBW = 0.14 x (HtWt)0.64 - 0.35 x weight. The height x weight parameter also predicts body surface area (BSA). These equations can be simplified, with slightly less precision, to the following: For boys, TBW = 20.88 x BSA - 4.29; for girls, TBW = 16.92 x BSA - 1.81. TBW is predicted without systematic deviations and equally well in boys and girls, North American and European, obese and nonobese, growth-retarded and normally sized, and pre- and postpubertal children. In contrast, previous anthropometric equations that were derived from healthy children systematically overpredicted TBW and were less precise in this pediatric PD population. In summary, a new set of anthropometric TBW prediction equations that are suited specifically for use in pediatric PD patients have been provided. 10. Bargman JM, Thorpe KE, Churchill DN et al. “Relative contribution of residual renal function and peritoneal clearance to adequacy of dialysis: a reanalysis of the CANUSA study.” Journal of the American Society of Nephrology (2001) 12(10):2158-62. Abstract: Studies of the adequacy of peritoneal dialysis and

	recommendations have assumed that renal and peritoneal clearances are comparable and therefore additive. The CANUSA data were reanalyzed in an effort to address this assumption. Among the 680 patients in the original CANUSA study, 601 had all of the variables of interest for this report. Adequacy of dialysis was estimated from GFR (mean of renal urea and creatinine clearance) and from peritoneal creatinine clearance. The Cox proportional-hazards model was used to evaluate the time-dependent association of these independent variables with patient survival. For each 5 L/wk per 1.73 m(2) increment in GFR, there was a 12% decrease in the relative risk (RR) of death (RR, 0.88; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.83 to 0.94) but no association with peritoneal creatinine clearance (RR, 1.00; 95% CI, 0.90 to 1.10). Estimates of fluid removal (24-h urine volume, net peritoneal ultrafiltration, and total fluid removal) then were added to the Cox model. For a 250-ml increment in urine volume, there was a 36% decrease in the RR of death (RR, 0.64; 95% CI, 0.51 to 0.80). The association of patient survival with GFR disappeared (RR, 0.99; 95% CI, 0.94 to 1.04). However, neither net peritoneal ultrafiltration nor total fluid removal was associated with

	patient survival. Although these results may be explained partly, statistically, by less variability in peritoneal clearance than in GFR, the latter seems to be physiologically more important than the former. The assumption of equivalence of peritoneal and renal clearances is not supported by these data. Recommendations for adequate peritoneal dialysis need to be reevaluated in light of these observations. 11. Cho Y1, Johnson DW, Craig JC, Strippoli GF, Badve SV, Wiggins KJ. Biocompatible dialysis fluids for peritoneal dialysis. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2014 Mar 27;3:CD007554. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD007554.pub2. BACKGROUND: The longevity of peritoneal dialysis (PD) is limited by high rates of technique failure, some of which stem from peritoneal membrane injury. 'Biocompatible' PD solutions have been developed to reduce damage to the peritoneal membrane. OBJECTIVES: This review aimed to look at the benefits and harms of biocompatible PD solutions in comparison to standard PD solutions in patients receiving PD. SEARCH METHODS: We searched the Cochrane Renal Group's Specialised Register (28 February 2013), through contact with the Trials Search Co-ordinator using search terms relevant to this review.

	Studies contained in the Specialised Register are identified through search strategies specifically designed for CENTRAL, MEDLINE and EMBASE, and handsearching conference proceedings. SELECTION CRITERIA: All randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and quasi-RCTs in adults and children comparing the effects of biocompatible PD solutions (neutral pH, lactate-buffered, low glucose degradation product (GDP); neutral pH, bicarbonate (± lactate)-buffered, low GDP; glucose polymer (icodextrin)) in PD were included. Studies of amino acid-based PD solutions were excluded. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS: Two authors extracted data on study quality and outcomes (including adverse effects). The authors contacted investigators to obtain missing information. Summary estimates of effect were obtained using a random-effects model, and results were expressed as risk ratios (RR) and their 95% confidence intervals (CI) for categorical variables, and mean difference (MD) or standardised mean difference (SMD) and 95% CI for continuous variables. MAIN RESULTS: Thirty-six eligible studies (2719 patients) were identified: Neutral pH, lactate-buffered/bicarbonate (± lactate)-buffered, low GDP PD solution (24); icodextrin (12). Allocation methods and concealment were generally incompletely reported, and adequate in only ten

	studies (27.8%). Patients lost to follow-up ranged from 0% to 83.4%. Neutral pH, low GDP versus conventional glucose PD solutionBased on generally sub-optimal quality evidence, the use of neutral pH, low GDP PD solutions was associated with larger urine volumes at the end of the studies, up to three years of therapy duration (7 studies, 520 patients: MD 126.39 mL/d, 95% CI 26.73 to 226.05). Improved preservation of residual renal function was evident in studies with greater than 12 month follow-up (6 studies, 360 patients: SMD 0.31, 95% CI 0.10 to 0.52). There was no significant effect on peritonitis, technique failure or adverse events with the use of neutral pH, low GDP PD solutions. Glucose polymer (icodextrin) versus conventional glucose PD solutionThere was a significant reduction in episodes of uncontrolled fluid overload (2 studies, 100 patients: RR 0.30, 95% CI 0.15 to 0.59) and improvement in peritoneal ultrafiltration (4 studies, 102 patients, MD 448.54 mL/d, 95% CI 289.28 to 607.80) without compromising residual renal function (4 studies, 114 patients: SMD 0.12, 95% CI -0.26 to 0.49) or urine output (3 studies, 69 patients: MD -88.88 mL/d, 95% CI -356.88 to 179.12) with icodextrin use. A comparable incidence of adverse events with the icodextrin (four studies) was reported. AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS:

	Based on generally sub-optimal quality studies, use of neutral pH, low GDP PD solution led to greater urine output and higher residual renal function after use exceeded 12 months. Icodextrin prescription improved peritoneal ultrafiltration and mitigated uncontrolled fluid overload. There were no significant effects on peritonitis, technique survival, patient survival or harms identified with their use. Based on the best available evidence, the use of these 'biocompatible' PD solutions resulted in clinically relevant benefits without added risks of harm. 12. Cadnapaphornchai MA1, Teitelbaum I. Strategies for the preservation of residual renal function in pediatric dialysis patients. Pediatr Nephrol. 2014 May;29(5):825-36; quiz 832. doi: 10.1007/s00467-013-2554-0. Epub 2013 Jul 19. Abstract: In adults with end-stage renal disease (ESRD), the preservation of residual renal function (RRF) has been shown to be associated with decreased mortality and improved control of complications of chronic kidney disease. However, less is known on the benefits of RRF in the pediatric dialysis population. The purpose of this article is to review the clinical significance of RRF and to discuss strategies for the preservation of RRF in children with ESRD.

	13. Watanabe A1, Lanzarini VV, Filho UD, Koch VH. Comparative role of PET and Kt/V determination in pediatric chronic peritoneal dialysis.Int J Artif Organs. 2012 Mar;35(3):199-207. doi: 10.5301/ijao.5000070. INTRODUCTION: Nutritional state and growth are considered as prognostic markers of chronic peritoneal dialysis (PD) adequacy in pediatric patients. The euvolemia, blood pressure control, and metabolic and electrolytic equilibrium are parameters to be achieved by PD treatment. OBJECTIVE: To describe the chronic PD prescription parameters of a cohort of pediatric patients and to compare the obtained hemodynamic, antrophometric and adequacy results with those suggested by the literature. METHODS: Retrospective analysis based on clinical records evaluation of 30 pediatric patients undergoing PD for more than 6 months from January 1998 to May 2005. RESULTS: In the present study, 17/30 (56.7%) were boys. Chronic kidney disease was secondary to uropathy in 66.7% of the cases. The infusion volume was > 1,000 ml/m2 in 9 patients. The peritoneal membrane was characterized as high (27.8%), high-average (33.3%), low-average (22.2%) and low transporter (16.7%). The weekly urea Kt/V was > 2.1 in all the

	evaluated patients. Blood pressure parameters above the 95th percentile despite the use of antihypertensive medication were observed in 5/30 patients, four of whom with CKD secondary to glomerulopathy. The initial and final Body Mass Index and weight for height ratio were preserved in 83.3% (25/30) patients. CONCLUSION: Elevated indexes of small solutes removal are easily attained in pediatric PD patients and do not imply optimal clinical management do not imply optimal climanagement. 14. Baştuğ F1, Dursun I, Dursun J et al. Could mini-PET be used to instead of 4 h original-PET to assess peritoneal permeability in children on peritoneal dialysis? Ren Fail. 2014 May;36(4):562-6. doi: 10.3109/0886022X.2013.879368. Epub 2014 Jan 23. BACKGROUND: Original peritoneal equilibration test (PET) is an implementation that requires hard work for peritoneal dialysis (PD) staff. Therefore, several authors have attempted to validate short and fast PET protocols, with controversial results. The aim of this study was to evaluate the concordance between the mini-PET and original PET in children. METHODS: In 26 stable continuous ambulatory PD patients, we performed an original PET with 2.27% (4 h) and a mini-PET with 3.86% glucose PD fluid

	(1 h) and compared ultrafiltration (UF) and small solute transports obtained with the two methods. RESULTS: Twenty-six children, 14 males, mean age 11.4 ± 5.6 (range 2.5-19 years), were included. Meantime on PD at time of enrollment was 35.2 ± 24.5 months (range 6-84 months). Based on the 4-h creatinine D/P data, the number of the patients within each transport category was as follow: high, 5; average, 18; low, 3. Kappa test showed a significant concordance between original PET and mini-PET (k=0.610). Based on the 4-h glucose D/D0 data, the number of the patients within each transport category was as follow: high, 5; average, 17; low, 4. Kappa test showed a moderate agreement between original PET and mini-PET (0.514, p=0.000). When Pearson correlation analysis between original PET and mini-PET was performed, there were significant positive correlations between original 2.27% PET and mini-PET (r=0.720, p=0.000, r=0.638, p=0.000, respectively). When comparing the numeric results of mini-PET and 4 h of original PET for D/Creatinine, by simple regression analysis, we found statistically significant correlation among PETs. CONCLUSIONS: In this study, we showed concordance between the mini-PET and original PET. The 3.86% mini-PET is simple and fast methods to assess free water transport. This also gives information about total UF and small

	solute transports and it is in good agreement with the original PET.

1a.4 OTHER SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

If source of evidence is NOT from a clinical practice guideline, USPSTF, or systematic review, please describe the evidence on which you are basing the performance measure.

1a.4.1 Briefly SYNTHESIZE the evidence that supports the measure. A list of references without a summary is not acceptable.

N/A

1a.4.2 What process was used to identify the evidence?

N/A

1a.4.3. Provide the citation(s) for the evidence.

N/A

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM—Measure Testing (subcriteria 2a2, 2b1-2b6)

Measure Number (*if previously endorsed*)**:** 2706
Measure Title: Pediatric Peritoneal Dialysis Adequacy: Achievement of Target Kt/V
Date of Submission: 1/7/2019
Type of Measure:

☐ Outcome (*including PRO-PM*)	☐ Composite – ***STOP – use composite testing form***
☒ Intermediate Clinical Outcome	☐ Cost/resource
☐ Process *(including Appropriate Use)*	☐ Efficiency
☐ Structure	

Instructions

- Measures must be tested for all the data sources and levels of analyses that are specified. ***If there is more than one set of data specifications or more than one level of analysis, contact NQF staff*** about how to present all the testing information in one form.
- **For all measures, sections 1, 2a2, 2b1, 2b2, and 2b4 must be completed.**
- **For outcome and resource use measures**, section **2b3** also must be completed.
- If specified for **multiple data sources/sets of specificaitons** (e.g., claims and EHRs), section **2b5** also must be completed.
- Respond to all questions as instructed with answers immediately following the question. All information on testing to demonstrate meeting the subcriteria for reliability (2a2) and validity (2b1-2b6) must be in this form. An appendix for *supplemental* materials may be submitted, but there is no guarantee it will be reviewed.
- If you are unable to check a box, please highlight or shade the box for your response.
- Maximum of 25 pages (*incuding questions/instructions;* minimum font size 11 pt; do not change margins). ***Contact NQF staff if more pages are needed.***
- Contact NQF staff regarding questions. Check for resources at Submitting Standards webpage.
- For information on the most updated guidance on how to address social risk factors variables and testing in this form refer to the release notes for version 7.1 of the Measure Testing Attachment.

Note: The information provided in this form is intended to aid the Standing Committee and other stakeholders in understanding to what degree the testing results for this measure meet NQF's evaluation criteria for testing.

2a2. Reliability testing [10] demonstrates the measure data elements are repeatable, producing the same results a high proportion of the time when assessed in the same population in the same time period and/or that the measure score is precise. For **instrument-based measures** (including PRO-PMs) **and composite performance measures**, reliability should be demonstrated for the computed performance score.

2b1. Validity testing [11] demonstrates that the measure data elements are correct and/or the measure score correctly reflects the quality of care provided, adequately identifying differences in quality. For **instrument-based measures (including PRO-PMs) and composite performance measures**, validity should be demonstrated for the computed performance score.

2b2. Exclusions are supported by the clinical evidence and are of sufficient frequency to warrant inclusion in the specifications of the measure; [12]

AND
If patient preference (e.g., informed decisionmaking) is a basis for exclusion, there must be evidence that the exclusion impacts performance on the measure; in such cases, the measure must be specified so that the information about patient preference and the effect on the measure is transparent (e.g., numerator category computed separately, denominator exclusion category computed separately). [13]

2b3. For outcome measures and other measures when indicated (e.g., resource use):
- **an evidence-based risk-adjustment strategy** (e.g., risk models, risk stratification) is specified; is based on patient factors (including clinical and social risk factors) that influence the measured outcome and are present at start of care; [14,15] and has demonstrated adequate discrimination and calibration

OR
- rationale/data support no risk adjustment/ stratification.

2b4. Data analysis of computed measure scores demonstrates that methods for scoring and analysis of the specified measure allow for **identification of statistically significant and practically/clinically meaningful** [16] **differences in performance**;
OR
there is evidence of overall less-than-optimal performance.

2b5. If multiple data sources/methods are specified, there is demonstration they produce comparable results.

2b6. Analyses identify the extent and distribution of **missing data** (or nonresponse) and demonstrate that performance results are not biased due to systematic missing data (or differences between responders and nonresponders) and how the specified handling of missing data minimizes bias.

Notes
10. Reliability testing applies to both the data elements and computed measure score. Examples of reliability testing for data elements include, but are not limited to: inter-rater/abstractor or intra-rater/abstractor studies; internal consistency for multi-item scales; test-retest for survey items. Reliability testing of the measure score addresses precision of measurement (e.g., signal-to-noise).
11. Validity testing applies to both the data elements and computed measure score. Validity testing of data elements typically analyzes agreement with another authoritative source of the same information. Examples of validity testing of the measure score include, but are not limited to: testing hypotheses that the measures scores indicate quality of care, e.g., measure scores are different for groups known to have differences in quality assessed by another valid quality measure or method; correlation of measure scores with another valid indicator of quality for the specific topic; or relationship to conceptually related measures (e.g., scores on process measures to scores on outcome measures). Face validity of the measure score as a quality indicator may be adequate if accomplished through a systematic and transparent process, by identified experts, and explicitly addresses whether performance scores resulting from the measure as specified can be used to distinguish good from poor quality. The degree of consensus and any areas of disagreement must be provided/discussed.
12. Examples of evidence that an exclusion distorts measure results include, but are not limited to: frequency of occurrence, variability of exclusions across providers, and sensitivity analyses with and without the exclusion.
13. Patient preference is not a clinical exception to eligibility and can be influenced by provider interventions.
14. Risk factors that influence outcomes should not be specified as exclusions.
15. With large enough sample sizes, small differences that are statistically significant may or may not be practically or clinically meaningful. The substantive question may be, for example, whether a statistically significant difference of one percentage point in the percentage of patients who received smoking cessation counseling (e.g., 74 percent v. 75 percent) is clinically meaningful; or whether a statistically significant difference of $25 in cost for an episode of care (e.g., $5,000 v. $5,025) is practically meaningful. Measures with overall less-than-optimal performance may not demonstrate much variability across providers.

1. DATA/SAMPLE USED FOR ALL TESTING OF THIS MEASURE

Often the same data are used for all aspects of measure testing. In an effort to eliminate duplication, the first five questions apply to all measure testing. If there are differences by aspect of testing,(e.g., reliability vs. validity) be sure to indicate the specific differences in question 1.7.

1.1. What type of data was used for testing? (*Check all the sources of data identified in the measure specifications and data used for testing the measure. Testing must be provided for all the sources of data specified and intended for measure implementation.* ***If different data sources are used for the numerator and denominator, indicate N [numerator] or D [denominator] after the checkbox.***)

Measure Specified to Use Data From: (*must be consistent with data sources entered in S.17*)	**Measure Tested with Data From:**
☐ abstracted from paper record	☐ abstracted from paper record
☒ claims	☒ claims
☒ registry	☒ registry
☐ abstracted from electronic health record	☐ abstracted from electronic health record
☐ eMeasure (HQMF) implemented in EHRs	☐ eMeasure (HQMF) implemented in EHRs
☐ other: Click here to describe	☐ other: Click here to describe

1.2. If an existing dataset was used, identify the specific dataset (*the dataset used for testing must be consistent with the measure specifications for target population and healthcare entities being measured; e.g., Medicare Part A claims, Medicaid claims, other commercial insurance, nursing home MDS, home health OASIS, clinical registry*).

CROWNWeb and Medicare Claims Data from January 2013 to December 2013

For the Spring 2019 maintenance submission, 2017 CROWNWeb and Medicare claims data were used.

1.3. What are the dates of the data used in testing? January 2013 to December 2013

For the Spring 2019 maintenance submission, January – December 2017 data were used.

1.4. What levels of analysis were tested? (*testing must be provided for all the levels specified and intended for measure implementation, e.g., individual clinician, hospital, health plan*)

Measure Specified to Measure Performance of: (*must be consistent with levels entered in item S.20*)	**Measure Tested at Level of:**
☐ individual clinician	☐ individual clinician
☐ group/practice	☐ group/practice
☒ hospital/facility/agency	☒ hospital/facility/agency
☐ health plan	☐ health plan
☐ other: Click here to describe	☐ other: Click here to describe

1.5. How many and which measured entities were included in the testing and analysis (by level of analysis and data source)? (*identify the number and descriptive characteristics of measured entities included in the analysis (e.g., size, location, type); if a sample was used, describe how entities were selected for inclusion in the sample*)

Testing was performed on data submitted for all pediatric PD patients with the restriction to facilities with 11 or more pediatric PD patients. These data represent 440 patients at 27 dialysis facilities. Public reporting of this measure on DFC or in the ESRD QIP would be restricted to facilities with at least 11 eligible patients for the measure. We have applied this restriction to all the reliability and validity testing reported here.

For the Spring 2019 maintenance submission, 31 facilities that had at least 11 eligible patients during January 2017 – December 2017 were included in the analyses. Public reporting of this measure on DFC or in the ESRD QIP would be restricted to facilities with at least 11 eligible patients for the measure to comply with restrictions on reporting of potentially patient identifiable information related to small cell size. We have applied this restriction to all the reliability and validity testing reported here.

1.6. How many and which patients were included in the testing and analysis (by level of analysis and data source)? (*identify the number and descriptive characteristics of patients included in the analysis (e.g., age, sex, race, diagnosis); if a sample was used, describe how patients were selected for inclusion in the sample*)

440 pediatric PD patients in facilities with at least 11 pediatric PD patients. 3,689 patient months were included in the calculation.

For the Spring 2019 maintenance submission, 525 patients who are from 31 facilities with at least 11 eligible patients, 3,924 patient months were included in the analyses.

1.7. If there are differences in the data or sample used for different aspects of testing (e.g., reliability, validity, exclusions, risk adjustment), identify how the data or sample are different for each aspect of testing reported below.

N/A

1.8 What were the social risk factors that were available and analyzed? For example, patient-reported data (e.g., income, education, language), proxy variables when social risk data are not collected from each patient (e.g. census tract), or patient community characteristics (e.g. percent vacant housing, crime rate) which do not have to be a proxy for patient-level data.

N/A

2a2. RELIABILITY TESTING

***Note**: If accuracy/correctness (validity) of data elements was empirically tested, separate reliability testing of data elements is not required – in 2a2.1 check critical data elements; in 2a2.2 enter "see section 2b2 for validity testing of data elements"; and skip 2a2.3 and 2a2.4.*

2a2.1. What level of reliability testing was conducted? (*may be one or both levels*)

☐ **Critical data elements used in the measure** (*e.g., inter-abstractor reliability; data element reliability must address ALL critical data elements*)

☒ **Performance measure score** (e.g., *signal-to-noise analysis*)

2a2.2. For each level checked above, describe the method of reliability testing and what it tests (*describe the steps—do not just name a method; what type of error does it test; what statistical analysis was used*)

We used January 2013 – December 2013 Claims data to calculate the inter-unit reliability (IUR) for the overall 12 months to assess the reliability of this measure. The NQF-recommended approach for determining measure reliability is a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), in which the between and within facility variation in the measure is determined. The inter-unit reliability (IUR) measures the proportion of the measure variability that is attributable to the between-facility variance. The yearly based IUR was estimated using a bootstrap approach, which uses a resampling scheme to estimate the within facility variation that cannot be directly estimated by ANOVA. We note that the method for calculating the IUR was developed for measures that are approximately normally distributed across facilities. Since this measure is not normally distributed, the IUR value should be interpreted with some caution.

For the Spring 2019 maintenance submission, we followed the same methodology as described above, using January 2017 – December 2017 CROWNWeb and Medicare Claims data.

2a2.3. For each level of testing checked above, what were the statistical results from reliability testing? (e.*g., percent agreement and kappa for the critical data elements; distribution of reliability statistics from a signal-to-noise analysis*)

For reliability we calculated the monthly and annual IUR across the 12 reporting months. As explained above, the method for calculating the IUR was developed for measures that are approximately normally distributed across facilities. IUR=0.961 with the confidence interval being (0.937, 0.979), which is high and suggests 96% of variation in the measure is attributed to between facility variation.

For the Spring 2019 maintenance submission, the annual IUR=0.866 across 12 reporting months, which suggests 87% of variation in the measure is attributed to between facility variation.

2a2.4 What is your interpretation of the results in terms of demonstrating reliability? (i.*e., what do the results mean and what are the norms for the test conducted?*)

The IUR suggest this measure is reliable. However, since the distribution of performance scores is skewed, the IUR value should be interpreted with some caution.

For the Spring 2019 maintenance submission, the IUR suggest this measure is still reliable. However, since the distribution of performance scores is skewed, the IUR value should be interpreted with some caution.

_____

2b1. VALIDITY TESTING

2b1.1. What level of validity testing was conducted? (*may be one or both levels*)

☐ **Critical data elements** (*data element validity must address ALL critical data elements*)

☒ **Performance measure score**

☐ **Empirical validity testing**

☒ **Systematic assessment of face validity of <u>performance measure score</u> as an indicator** of quality or resource use (*i.e., is an accurate reflection of performance on quality or resource use and can distinguish good from poor performance*) **NOTE**: Empirical validity testing is expected at time of maintenance review; if not possible, justification is required.

2b1.2. For each level of testing checked above, describe the method of validity testing and what it tests (*describe the steps—do not just name a method; what was tested, e.g., accuracy of data elements compared to authoritative source, relationship to another measure as expected; what statistical analysis was used)*

Assessment based on face validity by the 2013 PD pediatric TEP.

For the Spring 2019 maintenance submission, the measure is being maintained based on face validity.

2b1.3. What were the statistical results from validity testing? (*e.g., correlation; t-test*)

This measure is being maintained on the basis of face validity. Use of small solute clearance (urea reduction ratio and more recently Kt/V) as a dialysis quality measure was initially developed and approved by a Clinical TEP in 2013 which agreed that this quality measure domain will improve is important in the assessment of the quality of care for pediatric dialysis patients. Achieving target Kt/V for pediatric PD patients was finalized for the ESRD QIP beginning with PY 2018.

For the Spring 2019 submission, the text from the previous submission above still applies. The measure has been reported on DFC since October 2016.

2b1.4. What is your interpretation of the results in terms of demonstrating validity? (i*.e., what do the results mean and what are the norms for the test conducted?*)

This measure was established on the basis of face validity. Clinical TEP members agreed that this measure will improve quality of care for pediatric PD patients.

For the Spring 2019 submission, the measure is maintained on the basis of face validity. Clinical TEP members agreed that this measure will improve quality of care for pediatric PD patients.

_____

2b2. EXCLUSIONS ANALYSIS

NA ☒ no exclusions — *skip to section 2b3*

2b2.1. Describe the method of testing exclusions and what it tests (*describe the steps—do not just name a method; what was tested, e.g., whether exclusions affect overall performance scores; what statistical analysis was used*)

N/A

2b2.2. What were the statistical results from testing exclusions? (*include overall number and percentage of individuals excluded, frequency distribution of exclusions across measured entities, and*

impact on performance measure scores)
N/A

2b2.3. What is your interpretation of the results in terms of demonstrating that exclusions are needed to prevent unfair distortion of performance results? (*i.e., the value outweighs the burden of increased data collection and analysis. Note: **If patient preference is an exclusion**, the measure must be specified so that the effect on the performance score is transparent, e.g., scores with and without exclusion*)
N/A

_____

2b3. RISK ADJUSTMENT/STRATIFICATION FOR OUTCOME OR RESOURCE USE MEASURES
If not an intermediate or health outcome, or PRO-PM, or resource use measure, skip to section 2b4.

2b3.1. What method of controlling for differences in case mix is used?
☒ **No risk adjustment or stratification**
☐ **Statistical risk model with** Click here to enter number of factors **risk factors**
☐ **Stratification by** Click here to enter number of categories **risk categories**
☐ **Other,** Click here to enter description

2b3.1.1 If using a statistical risk model, provide detailed risk model specifications, including the risk model method, risk factors, coefficients, equations, codes with descriptors, and definitions.
N/A

2b3.2. If an outcome or resource use component measure is not risk adjusted or stratified, provide rationale and analyses to demonstrate that controlling for differences in patient characteristics (case mix) is not needed to achieve fair comparisons across measured entities.
N/A

2b3.3a. Describe the conceptual/clinical and statistical methods and criteria used to select patient factors (clinical factors or social risk factors) used in the statistical risk model or for stratification by risk (*e.g., potential factors identified in the literature and/or expert panel; regression analysis; statistical significance of p<0.10; correlation of x or higher; patient factors should be present at the start of care*)
Also discuss any "ordering" of risk factor inclusion; for example, are social risk factors added after all clinical factors?
N/A

2b3.3b. How was the conceptual model of how social risk impacts this outcome developed? Please check all that apply:
☐ **Published literature**
☐ **Internal data analysis**
☐ **Other (please describe)**

2b3.4a. What were the statistical results of the analyses used to select risk factors?
N/A

2b3.4b. Describe the analyses and interpretation resulting in the decision to select social risk factors
(e.g. prevalence of the factor across measured entities, empirical association with the outcome,

contribution of unique variation in the outcome, assessment of between-unit effects and within-unit effects.) **Also describe the impact of adjusting for social risk (or not) on providers at high or low extremes of risk.**
N/A

2b3.5. Describe the method of testing/analysis used to develop and validate the adequacy of the statistical model or stratification approach (*describe the steps—do not just name a method; what statistical analysis was used*)

Provide the statistical results from testing the approach to controlling for differences in patient characteristics (case mix) below.
If stratified, skip to 2b3.9

N/A

2b3.6. Statistical Risk Model Discrimination Statistics (*e.g., c-statistic, R-squared*)**:**
N/A

2b3.7. Statistical Risk Model Calibration Statistics (*e.g., Hosmer-Lemeshow statistic*):
N/A

2b3.8. Statistical Risk Model Calibration – Risk decile plots or calibration curves:
N/A

2b3.9. Results of Risk Stratification Analysis:

2b3.10. What is your interpretation of the results in terms of demonstrating adequacy of controlling for differences in patient characteristics (case mix)? (i*.e., what do the results mean and what are the norms for the test conducted*)

N/A

2b3.11. Optional Additional Testing for Risk Adjustment (*not required, but would provide additional support of adequacy of risk model, e.g., testing of risk model in another data set; sensitivity analysis for missing data; other methods that were assessed*)

N/A

_____
2b4. IDENTIFICATION OF STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT & MEANINGFUL DIFFERENCES IN PERFORMANCE
2b4.1. Describe the method for determining if statistically significant and clinically/practically meaningful differences in performance measure scores among the measured entities can be identified (*describe the steps—do not just name a method; what statistical analysis was used? Do not just repeat the information provided related to performance gap in 1b)*

Given that the number of facilities included in the calculation in 1.5 is only 27, the sample was determined to be too small to display useful data on meaningful differences.

For the Spring 2019 maintenance submission, given that the number of facilities included in the calculation in Section 1.5 is only 31, the sample was determined to be too small to display useful data on meaningful differences.

2b4.2. What were the statistical results from testing the ability to identify statistically significant and/or clinically/practically meaningful differences in performance measure scores across measured entities? (e.g., *number and percentage of entities with scores that were statistically significantly different from mean or some benchmark, different from expected; how was meaningful difference defined*)

N/A

2b4.3. What is your interpretation of the results in terms of demonstrating the ability to identify statistically significant and/or clinically/practically meaningful differences in performance across measured entities? (i.*e., what do the results mean in terms of statistical and meaningful differences?*)

N/A

_____

2b5. COMPARABILITY OF PERFORMANCE SCORES WHEN MORE THAN ONE SET OF SPECIFICATIONS ***If only one set of specifications, this section can be skipped*.**

Note*: This item is directed to measures that are risk-adjusted (with or without social risk factors)* ***OR*** *to measures with more than one set of specifications/instructions (e.g., one set of specifications for how to identify and compute the measure from medical record abstraction and a different set of specifications for claims or eMeasures). It does not apply to measures that use more than one source of data in one set of specifications/instructions (e.g., claims data to identify the denominator and medical record abstraction for the numerator).* ***Comparability is not required when comparing performance scores with and without social risk factors in the risk adjustment model. However, if comparability is not demonstrated for measures with more than one set of specifications/instructions, the different specifications (e.g., for medical records vs. claims) should be submitted as separate measures.***

2b5.1. Describe the method of testing conducted to compare performance scores for the same entities across the different data sources/specifications (*describe the steps—do not just name a method; what statistical analysis was used*)

N/A

2b5.2. What were the statistical results from testing comparability of performance scores for the same entities when using different data sources/specifications? (*e.g., correlation, rank order*)

N/A

2b5.3. What is your interpretation of the results in terms of the differences in performance measure scores for the same entities across the different data sources/specifications? (i.*e., what do the results*

mean and what are the norms for the test conducted)

N/A

_____

2b6. MISSING DATA ANALYSIS AND MINIMIZING BIAS

2b6.1. Describe the method of testing conducted to identify the extent and distribution of missing data (or nonresponse) and demonstrate that performance results are not biased due to systematic missing data (or differences between responders and nonresponders) and how the specified handling of missing data minimizes bias (*describe the steps—do not just name a method; what statistical analysis was used*)

Reporting months with missing values are not excluded from this measure. Missing months are used to help define the measure numerator (missing is counted as not meeting the minimum threshold), so introduction of bias from exclusion of missing values is not a consideration for the measure as specified.

2b6.2. What is the overall frequency of missing data, the distribution of missing data across providers, and the results from testing related to missing data? (*e.g., results of sensitivity analysis of the effect of various rules for missing data/nonresponse; if no empirical sensitivity analysis, identify the approaches for handling missing data that were considered and pros and cons of each*)

N/A

2b6.3. What is your interpretation of the results in terms of demonstrating that performance results are not biased due to systematic missing data (or differences between responders and nonresponders) and how the specified handling of missing data minimizes bias**?** (i*.e., what do the results mean in terms of supporting the selected approach for missing data and what are the norms for the test conducted; if no empirical analysis, provide rationale for the selected approach for missing data*)

N/A